

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

NATHAN WARREN FISK McCLURE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:23-CV-702-RAH-KFP
)	
COLONEL PRITCHETT, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Pro se Plaintiff Nathan McClure filed this action on December 6, 2023. Defendants filed an Answer and Special Report, with supporting evidentiary materials, denying Plaintiff's allegations. Doc. 36. The Court ordered Plaintiff to file a response by May 28, 2024, and warned that a failure to comply would result in a recommendation of dismissal for failure to prosecute. Doc. 37. To date, Plaintiff has failed to comply.

Because of Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's order, the undersigned concludes this case should be dismissed without prejudice. *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (stating that dismissal for failure to obey a court order is generally not an abuse of discretion where litigant has been forewarned). The authority to impose sanctions for failure to prosecute or obey an order is longstanding and acknowledged by Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–30 (1962). This authority empowers the courts "to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." *Id.* at 630–31; *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir.

1989) (holding that “[t]he district court possesses the inherent power to police its docket.”). “The sanctions imposed [upon dilatory litigants] can range from a simple reprimand to an order dismissing the action with or without prejudice.” *Mingo*, 864 F.2d at 102.

For the above reasons, the undersigned Magistrate Judge RECOMMENDS that this case be DISMISSED without prejudice.

Further, it is ORDERED that by **July 16, 2024**, the parties may file objections to this Recommendation. The parties must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which objection is made. Frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered. This Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore, is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) will bar a party from a de novo determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waive the right of the party to challenge on appeal the District Court’s order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. 11th Cir. R. 3–1.

DONE this 2nd day of July, 2024.

/s/ Kelly Fitzgerald Pate
KELLY FITZGERALD PATE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE